

28th March 1952]

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Madras Appropriation Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 1 of 1952), as passed by the Legislative Assembly and transmitted to the Council be read a third time and passed.’ ”

The motion was carried.

(2) THE MADRAS CONSOLIDATED FUND (WITHDRAWAL OF MONEYS) BILL, 1952 (L.A. BILL NO. 2 OF 1952) (AS PASSED BY THE ASSEMBLY).

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move—

*‘ That the Madras Consolidated Fund (Withdrawal of Moneys), Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 2 of 1952), as passed by the Legislative Assembly and transmitted to the Council be taken into consideration at once.’*

“ As explained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, this Bill is introduced in pursuance of Article 206 of the Constitution to provide for the withdrawal from the Consolidated Fund of the State, of the moneys required to meet—

(a) the grants made in advance by the Legislative Assembly in respect of the estimated expenditure of the State Government for a part of the year 1952-53, and

(b) the expenditure charged on the said Fund for the same part of that year.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ Motion moved—

‘ That the Madras Consolidated Fund (Withdrawal of Moneys) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 2 of 1952), as passed by the Legislative Assembly and transmitted to the Council be taken into consideration at once.’ ”

SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I did not want to make any speech on this Consolidated Fund (Withdrawal of Moneys) Bill, but I could not resist the temptation of taking this opportunity to speak about a reply which the Hon. Minister for Food gave in the Assembly a couple of days ago, that on an examination of the question the Government decided not to try the levy system of procurement in Malabar district. Sir, I thought I would not get an opportunity to speak about this subject, but as the Bill authorises the withdrawal of moneys from the Consolidated Fund of the State for the service of a part of the financial year, this matter of procurement also comes under that. I am very sorry that that answer was given. Apart from what I feel about the question of the levy system of procurement, the whole district of Malabar, for the last one year, is excited over the question of introduction of the levy system of procurement. The leading newspapers of the district have been gathering opinions from individuals, associations and also legislators as to whether the levy system of procurement should be introduced in Malabar or not, and there has not been a single opinion against it. About three

[Sri K. Madhava Menon] [28th March 1952]

months ago, while I was in office, I suggested at a Conference of the Director of Civil Supplies, the Commissioner of Civil Supplies, the Food Secretary—the Hon. Food Minister was not in town that day—and the Hon. Chief Minister, that at least as an experimental measure, this levy system of procurement should be introduced in one of the two surplus taluks of Malabar district, for one season beginning from the month of *Kanni*, so that the people who were excited over it might know what it was. We came to a tentative conclusion to try the scheme in one of the two surplus taluks as an experiment and asked the Commissioner of Civil Supplies to work out details. I had taken it for granted that that was approved. I was really taken by surprise—and not a little surprise—when so soon after that, and so soon after I left office, a reply came from the Government that they had decided not to try the scheme. The scheme may be good or may not be good, but the Government are taking too much for granted in this matter. I request, I appeal and I entreat the Government that the scheme may be tried, at least as an experimental measure, in one taluk for one season to satisfy the people of the district. The Government have been carrying on intensive procurement in this district for the last five years. They can refer to the revenue records and take the average of five years production. They know what area of the land is cultivated and how much food is produced therein. They can take the highest average of the five years and on that levy what is due. They need not reduce their demands even by one grain of what they got last year. But once the Government make the demand, they should not go, search and harass the people further. That is what the people require and want the Government to do. I request that the Government may be pleased to revise the orders passed in this matter, and order the levy system of procurement, at least as an experimental measure in one taluk. Even if the scheme is a failure, the Government are not going to lose much because the entire procurement in Malabar district is so little. But the Government can gain some goodwill and lose nothing by the scheme. If it is a success it can be continued; otherwise it can be stopped. At least for heaven's sake, please try this scheme in one taluk for one season during the ensuing procurement year. That is my appeal, Sir."

11-30  
a.m.

\* DR. S. GURUBATHAM :—" Mr. Chairman, I feel this is the appropriate moment for me to say a few words about the question that has been raised on the Hon. Food Minister's statement in the other House that movement restrictions would be lifted, but price restrictions would continue so far as millets are concerned. Sir, I would like to say that the time has come when these controls should be lifted wholesale.

" In the first place there is no agency to effectively work these controls. People have been starved due to these controls. They are now starving with your 6 oz. rice. Starting with 12 oz., you have been generous to bring it down to 6 oz. Black-market has



28th March 1952] [Dr. S. Gurubatham]

flourished. Rice is being openly sold in black-market and Government are not able to check this practice. It is time that they give up their policy of controls when they are not able to enforce it effectively.

“As regards control of prices of foodgrains there again the Government of Madras have let down the producer of this State very badly. The Economic Adviser to the Government of India has given certain facts and figures. During the year 1939, the price of paddy per maund all over India was somewhere near four rupees and during 1944 it was in the range of nine rupees in all provinces. After 1944, the prices have risen very high. In practically all provinces the price of paddy increased. In the United Provinces, an entirely surplus province with regard to rice, the price per maund was fifteen rupees. When, in places like the United Provinces, Bengal and Assam where the mighty Ganges, Jumna and Brahmaputra irrigate the lands, the price was 15 rupees, in Madras which depends solely on rainfall for watering its fields, the price was as low as nine rupees. This is so because the Madras Government did not bring sufficient pressure on the Government of India to change the price level. Recently the Hon. Food Minister announced an increase of one rupee, eight annas per maund. Well, I should say that this meagre enhancement in the procurement price was an insult to the producer. It ought to have been commensurate with the prices obtaining in the rest of India. The price for paddy that is being paid to the producer in this State now is practically the same as the price paid during 1944. I ask, why there should be such a disparity when other States are paying as much as twenty rupees for the producers? If you want the control to exist, you must control it effectively. You should see to it that prices are maintained at a reasonable level. If proper justice has been meted out to the producers, the present food problem would have become a simple affair. But what is happening now?

“Take the case of the Nellore district, for example. You say that procurement in Nellore district was not up to the mark during last year. Then how do you account for Kalahasti which produced no paddy during last season, exporting rice to Chittoor and other districts. The cause is due to rice produced in Nellore being smuggled to Kalahasti and transported from there to Chittoor and other places as Kalahasti rice. I ask, when this is the case, what is the necessity for having control over rice? This shows the utter incapacity of the Government to have effective control over the movement of foodgrains.

“When this is the state of affairs, we hear the Food Minister saying that the prices should continue to be controlled. The Hon. Minister thinks that by simply increasing the procurement price of paddy by one rupee, eight annas per maund, the food situation could be eased. I am prepared to challenge his statement. This meagre enhancement is an insult to the producer. The food situation would not be eased but continue to worsen.

[Dr. S. Gurubatham]

[28th March 1952]

“ The Hon. Minister is not a cultivator himself though he may own several acres. He is not aware of the difficulties of the agriculturists who are actual cultivators. I sound a note of warning that unless you are going to raise the cost of rice and millets to the same level at which they are being sold in the rest of India, this food problem will continue to become worse. I am even prepared to go into prison and lead a satyagraha on this fundamental question. The present price which the Government are offering to the producer is simply killing him.

“ Eighty-seven and a half per cent of our population are living in the villages. Only  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent are remaining in cities. Out of these  $87\frac{1}{2}$  per cent almost half of them are producers. They are not all producers owning 100 or 200 acres of land but small landholders holding one to five acres of land. The meagre price paid to them for their produce has made their lot still worse. The other day our ex-Chief Minister, Sri O. P. Ramaswami Reddiar observed on the floor of the House that the ryots have lost nearly 200 crores of rupees owing to the Government's food policy. It is no exaggeration at all. The Government have now killed the goose that had been laying golden eggs. By controlling the price level at nine rupees per maund and that too where rainfall is scanty and there is water scarcity, they have practically killed the producers. The one argument that is being advanced against increased price has been that it would bring agitation from the clerical staff and industrial labour for increased emoluments. The Government ought to have solved the problem of salary and wages to the satisfaction of the people concerned. Instead, they have dumped the burden on the producers and robbed them of 200 crores. That is the reason why the party that has been in power so long has come to the present level. If instead of learning a lesson from the reverses sustained during the elections, the Government still persist in their food policy, the result is going to be only chaos.”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ But the Food Minister has won the elections! ”

DR. S. GURUBATHAM :—“ Yes, the Food Minister has succeeded. I am not going into the details of it. But the Ministers doing good work have all been defeated. The Hon. Minister should take note of this fact.

“ If, in spite of all shortcomings, the Government still persist in retaining controls, I would only say that it would be utterly foolish to do so, if that word can be used here and is parliamentary. If at all the Government want to keep controls going, it is incumbent on their part to see that prices are fixed at an economic level. In the absence of it, only discontent would grow. Let not the Government drive the poor producers to a revolution. Let them not be driven into the hands of the Communists. I know you do not want the Communists to come to power. But unless you take a lively interest in the welfare of the producers, such a catastrophe



28th March 1952] [Dr. S. Gurubatham]

is bound to come. I am sorry to say that villagers to-day are in a worse plight than they were in under the Britishers. The foreign Government drove out spinning, our only national industry at that time. But to-day the popular Government are driving out agriculture also. I once again warn the members on the Treasury Bench that if they do not pay heed to the needs of the producers and solve the food problem to their satisfaction, there would be revolution in the country."

\* THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA :—" Sir, I never expected that such a situation would arise here in which I would be called upon to explain matters which I thought had been effectively disposed of in the other House. One or two points have been raised about our Food policy. While I would try to answer them, I would like to say as I said in the other House, that these questions cannot be solved at one stroke by the present Government and so it would be better to leave it as it is now so that the same could be gone into in detail by the incoming Government.

" Regarding the levy system, Sri Madhava Menon has raised the question again. It is not true that we waited till he resigned, to issue that order regarding levy system. It was long under consideration by the Government. The reason for not introducing the levy system in Malabar district was that it would mean a change in our policy which we had been following since 1951 and which we propose to follow during 1952 also, with some occasional changes here and there. Our food policy has been approved by the Government of India and it is not possible for this Government to take any steps without further consulting the Central Government. When this policy was introduced in 1951, we selected some areas for intensive procurement and some other areas for the levy system. We also followed a sort of middle course in some areas. The chief reason for selecting these areas was the possibility of meeting our requirements for the whole State. We knew how much would be available in the State according to the previous procurement figures. Over and above that we asked the Central Government to supply the needs of the State with a view to keep up the rationing at a certain level. Whenever we wanted to make any changes in the procurement system, the Government of India put the question to us whether under the new system we would be able to procure as much foodgrains as we were doing formerly, in view of the fact that owing to the increasing difficulty of getting supplies from abroad, this State should try its level best by adopting different methods to procure as much as possible within the State, and then only go to the Government of India for supplying the balance with a view to keep up the present scale of rationing and meet the needs of the people for the whole year. According to the system we adopted, we took up certain districts for the trial of the levy system. These districts were either completely self-sufficient or more or less self-sufficient districts, e.g., Tiruchirappalli, Madurai, South Kanara

11-45  
a.m.

[Sri J. L. P. Roche Victoria] [28th March 1952]

and South Arcot. When we introduced the levy system in these districts it was insisted that each district should be satisfied with whatever was procured in the district to meet the needs of the district and that the Government should not be asked to give any help from outside. It was with a view to make these districts self-sufficient that the levy system was introduced there. This system was tried in Coimbatore also under different circumstances. It was an experiment we tried in a deficit district and the result was not at all happy. The report which went from here to the Government of India was scrutinised and we were advised that that system would not work in a deficit district. The same thing applies to Malabar district. As I said the other day in the other House, Malabar is a heavily deficit district. Only in a few taluks, is there any surplus for procurement; all the other taluks in the whole of the Malabar district are entirely deficit areas for which we have to import foodgrains from other surplus districts of the State. In these surplus districts, we have intensive procurement and there are complaints of harassment. We are not able to change this system for the simple reason that if we change the system we may not be able to procure as much as we are procuring to-day to meet the needs of the State. The only thing we can do is to wait for better times with a view to introduce the levy system throughout the State or at least throughout the surplus districts in order to meet the demands of the deficit districts as much as possible from what is got from these surplus districts. As I said at the beginning, any change in the existing system requires a thorough examination. There should be an improvement in the situation, because under the levy system we are sure to get only less than what we get under the intensive procurement system. We cannot experiment with that system in an area in which we would get only less than what we get under the intensive procurement system. Of course harassment is there. Nobody denies that the people are sometimes subject to all sorts of harassment in the course of procurement. Even under the levy system complaints of harassment have come to us. By merely introducing the levy system, we cannot get rid of complaints of harassment. That is not at all correct, because even from the districts in which we have introduced the levy system complaints about harassment have come to us. Officers go for the levy and the producers give the levy; afterwards it is found that what has been given is not the right quantity and something has been hidden and sold in the open market. Our officers go and ask for more and there is a tussle. Therefore by merely introducing the levy system we cannot get rid of harassment entirely. Of course the Government have been issuing instructions from time to time and we have also been punishing officers who have gone out of the way and given unnecessary trouble to the people. Of course we must try and reduce the opportunities for harassment as much as possible. But merely because there is some harassment and people think that the levy system will be good, it cannot be introduced, because we have to take into consideration the conditions prevailing in the



28th March 1952] [Sri J. L. P. Roche Victoria]

whole State. And this is not a matter which this Government alone can decide. It forms part of the policy which is pursued by the Central Government. The policy we followed in 1951 we are going to follow in 1952. It cannot be changed now without taking all the facts I have mentioned into consideration.

“ My hon. Friend Sri Madhava Menon need not think that just because he is not in office, we have taken advantage of that position to give the reply that the levy system cannot be tried in Malabar. I am sure the new Government when it comes into office will examine the position again taking into consideration all the difficulties I have just now explained. If, in consultation with the Central Government, they are able to devise a method by which the needs of the people will be met and there will be less of harassment, some such arrangement can be made. That requires, as I have said, a change in the present policy pursued by the Government.

“ With regard to the points raised by my hon. Friend Dr. Gurubatham, hon. Members know that this Government have been trying for a very long time to raise the procurement price of food-grains. An increase of eight annas a maund was allowed from November last year. Since we were not satisfied with it, an agitation was kept up and finally the Government of India agreed to raise the price by another one rupee from 1st January this year. This has given some satisfaction to the producers. There is no doubt about it. Whatever may be the opinion of the hon. Member, I am sure this increase has given general satisfaction to the producers. It may be that the increase may not be sufficient in the opinion of some of the producers, but taking into consideration the conditions prevailing here, there is no use of comparing the prices here with the prices prevailing in other States, for the conditions are not the same in all the States. Conditions vary in different States and as long as this system of control and rationing continues, it is not possible to do anything more than what has been done up to now. The hon. Member Dr. Gurubatham might propose to have decontrol throughout the State. It is a big all-India question and it is not possible to take each State by itself and say that we may have decontrol of grains and decontrol of prices there and everything will find its level. It is all easily said. This Government feel that but for this control, the people would have suffered much more. The agriculturists no doubt require all encouragement, but they must also take into consideration the condition of the non-producers. If the non-producers are able to get the foodgrains at least at a certain level of prices, I think it is largely due to the control over the prices. According to Dr. Gurubatham, the best solution will be to remove all controls and allow each one to buy according to his needs. That is an experiment which this Government do not think is a practicable proposition at the present moment. If Dr. Gurubatham is able to convince the Government, not only this Government but also the Central Government, as to the advisability or the feasibility of doing such a thing, if he is able to adduce

[Sri J. L. P. Roche Victoria] [28th March 1952]

strong arguments supported by facts and figures, well and good. But as far as this Government are concerned, we think that it is not at all possible at the present moment. Knowing as we do the varying conditions prevailing in different parts of the State in different times—famine in certain areas and floods in certain other areas—it is not possible to meet the situation by merely decontrolling and saying that the Government take no responsibility for the consequences and each one might buy the foodgrains according to his needs. That is a point which this Government are not prepared to concede as it goes against the very fundamental policy followed by the Government of India taking into consideration the conditions prevailing throughout the whole country. This is all I can say on the points raised by hon. Members to-day."

\* THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, my hon. Friend Dr. Gurubatham is sincerely interested in agriculture and rural development. This Government, as the House is well aware, just like other State Governments are implementing the five-year plan, which has given the pride of place to agricultural development. In this State which is mainly agricultural, we realise full well the importance of giving priority to increased agricultural production. The first essential for agriculture being extension of irrigation facilities, this Government have undertaken a large programme of irrigation development. The extension of irrigation facilities will change the agricultural pattern over large areas of the State and permanently solve our food deficit problem. We are budgeting for large sums year after year for agricultural development.

12  
noon.

"As regards controls, this is a matter which has been considered over and over again by economic experts at a higher level. Even the other day, while replying to the budget debate in Parliament the Finance Minister at the Centre, Sir C. D. Deshmukh adduced cogent arguments as to why we should retain controls in certain essential matters so long as there is shortage of supply. The Planning Commission also have considered this question and they have pointed out that certain controls are necessary in the present circumstances obtaining in this country. If the controls are removed, it will hit the economically weaker classes. My Friend, when he was a member of the Cabinet, knew full well how, when the controls were removed in 1948 or so, the prices shot up and controls had to be re-imposed again. Different people look at different controls from their own limited points of view and they do not view the problem in an overall perspective. Nobody says that we should have control absolutely or decontrol absolutely in all matters. It all depends on the circumstances prevailing at the time in regard to the supply and demand position, as stated by the Minister of Finance at the Centre.

"My hon. Friend said that this Government are neglecting the development of khadi also. I believe the Madras Government have done more for khadi than the Government of any other State as my hon. Friend himself must be well aware. The House is



28th March 1952] [Sri A. B. Shetty]

well aware that we have come through difficult years and we have to face difficult years in the future. With shortage of food, and other essential commodities, with high and rising prices and with a succession of bad seasons, this Government have had unprecedented difficulties. Yet this Government can claim that they have a good record of achievements to their credit in spite of all the exacting conditions under which we had to work during this time. As a matter of fact, I can take department after department—Agriculture, Industries, Road development, Harijan Welfare and so on—and show how we have maintained the progressive character of the administration in all these different fields of activity. (Interruption). Of course, it has become the fashion with many people to say that the election results show that the people as a whole have not approved the policy and the programme and the work of the Ministry. It is wrong to put the blame on the present Government for the many difficulties we are experiencing at present, difficulties which have been created as a result of the Great World War through which we have passed, difficulties which have been made still greater on account of the partition and the unfavourable seasons we have had during these five years. But, in spite of all these difficulties, as I have said, we can make bold to claim that we have achieved progress in many directions. It is true we have not been able to do many of the things we wanted, but yet something has been attempted and something done and that is the only satisfaction we can have."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The question is—

' That the Bill to authorise the withdrawal of moneys from the Consolidated Fund of the State for the service of a part of the financial year commencing on the 1st April 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 2 of 1952) as passed by the Assembly, be taken into consideration at once.' "

The motion was carried and the Bill taken into consideration. Clause 2 was put and carried.

The Schedule was put and carried.

Clause 1 was put and carried.

The Preamble was put and carried.

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" Sir, I move—

' *That the Bill be read a third time and passed.*' "

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The motion is—

' *That the Bill be read a third time and passed.*' "

SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Sir, I have been listening to the Hon. Food Minister's speech in reply to what I spoke about procurement. I want to clear a misunderstanding. It is not a change of policy that I asked for; it is not giving up procurement that I asked for. I said that procurement will be necessary as long

[Sri K. Madhava Menon] [28th March 1952]

as the supply is short of the demand. What I want is, you procure what you have been procuring all along. In fact, you have got your figures of procurement for the last five years in the area where there has been intensive procurement. The Hon. Minister said that levy system necessarily means getting less than what they have been getting before. I beg to differ from him. I do not want them to get a grain less than what they have been getting before. You have measured every inch of land that is under cultivation and you have the procurement figures for each plot of land. What I say is, you may take what you have taken during the last five years or even the highest average for the last five years. Take that from the cultivator and once he gives that, do not go and search that man every day. And if he has got anything beyond what he has given, and if he wants to sell, he must sell it to the Government and the Government must pay the retail price for the quantity sold. That is what we have decided at the Conference and we wanted the Government to try that in one of the taluks in the whole district. As I said, there are only two surplus taluks in the district. This is what the Conference agreed. It was more or less given out in the papers that the Government proposed to do it in the ensuing year's procurement. Even my hon. Friend, Mr. Narayana Menon wrote an article in the papers that if it is necessary, you may levy what exactly you were getting before and collect it; but when once that is collected, you should not go further, but allow the grain to move within the taluk and if people want to sell outside the taluk it must be sold to the Government and the Government must pay the retail price. That is not a new thing and that is only what is obtaining there. That is not a change of policy and it does not require the sanction of any Government. If the Government have the good-will, I only ask them to try it."

\* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" Sir, while the Hon. Minister was introducing this Bill he mentioned that during the last five years this Government had been progressing steadily in the department of Agriculture and in certain other departments. But, Sir, the fact is exactly the reverse. Have we been progressing in the right direction? The country would have excused those in power if only they had taken the country in the right direction, even though their achievements might not have been very much, but we find exactly the reverse. What was the condition of the State five years ago, and what is its condition now? If five years ago we found the country poor in the economic sense, to-day we find it poorer. Actually it is the estimate of the Economic Adviser that we have been steadily going down at the rate of 2 per cent per year in the matter of average income per individual. During the last five years the income per individual has gone down to the extent of something like 12 per cent. In other words, the misery of the people has increased; people are poorer and the country is poorer; and production is less. It is the same even in other fields.



28th March 1952] [Sri S. B. Adityan]

“ Sir, five years ago they said that we had a Police State. We thought we would soon have a Welfare State. But, what do we find? We are still having the Police State, with this difference. Instead of the ordinary Police State five years ago, we are having the Armed Police State to-day. That is the only difference.

“ Then, Sir, what about production? Some years ago, it was said the people were given 14 oz. or 16 oz. of foodgrains. But, to-day after five years we have either 6 oz. or 7 oz. Taking stock of what we have achieved during the five years, we find that the country has been taken in the wrong direction.

“ Sir, this being the last occasion, I think, a word about the achievement of the Government during the last five years, may not be out of place. Have this Government succeeded or failed? And how to measure the success or failure of a Government? The only method by which the Government could be said to have succeeded or failed is to see whether the country has been taken towards economic advancement. If the absence of a yard-stick, or a measure or a touchstone by which the success or failure of the Government could be tested the only criterion is to find out, whether the Government have raised the standard of living of the people. Is the average income per individual more? If the average man gets a better income, however small it might be, then it might be said that the Government have succeeded to that extent. If the economic level of the people as a whole has been improved, it can be said that the Government have succeeded to that extent. The average level of income per individual in this country is something like one-fifth of what it is in Russia; something like one-sixteenth of the average income in Britain and one-fortieth of the American standard. That is the U.N.O. figure, Sir. But, have you taken this country even one step towards the economic improvement of the people so that we could hope that after some years this country would be on a level with other countries? No. On the other hand, you have taken the country in the opposite direction. This country is poorer and the gap between the economic level of this country and other countries is getting wider.

“ Sir, credit is being taken by the Government for keeping law and order. I submit that after Independence to claim any credit for keeping law and order, is altogether out of place. No doubt, a foreign power which rules over another country can claim credit for keeping law and order, because the object of the Government is to keep the administration going. If any other power is ruling this country, then it could claim credit for keeping law and order. But, in a national and an Independent Government, to claim credit for keeping law and order, I submit, is altogether wrong. The aim of the Government is not merely to keep law and order, but also to take the country towards its economic advancement by the establishment of more and more factories and more and more mills and so on. Sir, to-day famine is raging in large areas of this State. If only the country had been industrialised, and more people had been employed in industries rather than in agriculture, the so-called adverse seasonal conditions would not have affected

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[28th March 1952]

12-15 P.M. this country to the extent they have. For in the old days the organisation of the Government was such that the whole object of the Government was to keep the *status quo*, to keep law and order, to keep peace and to keep things as they were. The administration was so planned or so organised to keep the conditions as they were. That was all right in those days. But now our object is not to keep things as they are, not to keep the country poor as it is, not to keep the level of the people at 1/16th of the level of the people in foreign countries but to make a change for the good. So the whole administrative machinery should be changed; it should be reorganised; fresh industries should be started; they should be started in tens and hundreds so that people in hundreds and thousands may find employment in them. Let the industries be of all kinds; let there be factories for cement, glass or paper or anything, so that people may get employment and draw decent wages. Sir, with that object in view the administrative set-up ought to be reorganised. Instead of doing that we are getting on with the old set-up. So it is no wonder the people are not satisfied. Without an industrial revolution in the land it is impossible to improve the low economic level of the people. So the first thing that ought to be done is to reorganise the administrative machinery so that there may be an all-out fight against poverty. There should be all-out industrialisation. Instead of confining themselves to offices and saying 'no' to every application, those holding positions of authority should go to the people, mix with them and create enthusiasm to create new industries. What the people require most now is employment and that can be provided only by starting more and more industries. To that purpose, the whole administration should be directed. Then only will the economic standard of the people improve. Now that has not been done; and the result is, we find the country poorer than what it was five years ago. I hope the incoming Government will direct its energies to the primary object of carrying on an all-out fight against poverty and to the carrying out of industrialisation of the country so that there will be full employment for the people all the year round, the present undue stress on agriculture may be relieved and adverse effects in the country by the failure of the monsoons may be mitigated.

"Sir, this being the last day of the session, I wish to say that whatever the faults and merits of the present Government were, the proceedings of this House have been conducted on a very high plane; and we are indeed grateful to you, Sir, for keeping such a high level of debate. That has been the testimony of those who have come here from other States and seen and heard the debates. Many have come from other States and from foreign countries, and they have paid a high tribute to the level of debate conducted here. So, Sir, it is but right that I should, on this occasion, the last day of our session, express my appreciation of the way in which the proceedings have been conducted under your Chairmanship, and I hope, whoever presides over this House in future, will follow the precedents set up by you."



28th March 1952]

\* SRI KALA VENKATA RAO :—" Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to say a few words."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I suppose you are speaking on the Bill. You are not going to throw a bouquet at me. (Laughter.) There is another subject on the agenda after this Bill is finished."

\* SRI KALA VENKATA RAO :—" I shall speak only for two or three minutes. You, Sir, need not invite bouquets. (Laughter.)"

" Mr. Chairman, I would not have spoken to-day but for what the last two speakers have said in their speeches; one of them is Mr. Adityan, an hon. Member occupying a seat in the Opposition to-day and the other is Dr. Gurubatham, an ex-colleague of mine. But for their speeches I would not have spoken to-day. To the aims and objects which Mr. Adityan narrated, nobody will have any serious objection. Of course he used slightly strong words, new words which he has now acquired on account of his alliance with new friends recently! (Laughter). The one thing everybody knows is that India is poor and that to take her out of the morass of poverty it would require great energy on the part of the Governments of the day and more than that, it requires the willing co-operation of the people. To say that after this Government came to power, everything has gone downward and everything has decreased is to attribute something to satisfy his new friends in the new legislature. Is there greater poverty now? The charge is not worthy of being made by my friend Mr. Adityan."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" On a matter of personal explanation, Sir. I was saying that the economic condition of the people of India was always low, we have not tried to raise it and our present economic status only shows that."

\* SRI KALA VENKATA RAO :—" Sir, I am saying one thing and he is saying another thing. Did he not say, Sir, that the condition of the people now is better than what it was and that for that the Congress Government are responsible? Till recently he was a member of the Government party; he was directing the work in this House and he was supporting the policies of the Government and he would have been justified in trying to change the policy of the Government then if he had wished to do so. Whether the policy of the Government has increased the poverty of the masses is a moot question. I will tell you, Sir, that that is not correct. Firstly, the hon. Member, Mr. Adityan is the editor of a great newspaper running three or four editions a day in various cities and he could have disclosed the way to prosperity. Sir, what happened in the United States of America soon after she got her independence? Did not Washington say to his people, 'Even after you got Independence there is so much poverty among you.' What happened in Russia, which Mr. Adityan quoted, soon after she turned Soviet? From 1917 to 1928, that is immediately after the

[Sri Kala Venkata Rao]

[28th March 1952]

Revolution, there was a famine almost every year followed by pestilence and death. Now, can any one say that such a thing has happened in India or in Madras? No; things that occurred in Russia and America of those days did not occur soon after we attained Independence. Sir, the lack of economic prosperity among our people can be due to many things. It is due to our increase in population. For my own part I have not contributed my quota towards that. (Laughter.) And I do not think Mr. Adityan is so innocent as myself in that field. (Laughter.) Mr. Adityan took pains to quote figures of economic level of the people of other countries and he compared them with the corresponding figures in India. I am afraid the percentages will go down further because our population is increasing by leaps and bounds. It has increased recently by two and a half crores. So, Sir, let me tell my friend that the causes lie beyond our control. To say that the Government have not done anything to improve the lot of the people is wrong. On the other hand, facts will show that much has been done and is being done. It will soon usher in an era of prosperity. The Five-year Plan has to be implemented soon, and at the end of that period, another four or five-year plan will come up, and in this way we will go on as other countries have done, for that is what Russia did immediately after the Revolution in 1917. I quote Russia as an example, because Mr. Adityan quoted that country as his example!

“ Then, Sir, Mr. Adityan blamed this Government for their administration of the Police portfolio. He said, that our State is not merely an ordinary Police State but an armed Police State. It is an argument put forward for the sake of mere argument. I am sure Mr. Adityan has never been a victim of the armed police even once during the last four and a half years. I do not think anybody has been a victim of police action unless he adopted violent methods. So to allege that this Government was responsible for a certain violence will only strengthen anti-Government forces in their advocacy of violence and I have to record my protest against it.

“ Regarding Dr. Gurubatham I wish to say a few words. He is a learned man. He fought very strongly for the spread of Khadi in the State. He was a Minister and was my colleague. At that time he tried his best for the spread of khadi. We have all heard him on the floor of this House propagating the spread of Khadi. A pious Christian, simple, very calm, mild and unassuming he was always by temperament. Yet to-day he accuses the Government for a thing for which they are not responsible. The Government are not at all in the wrong. The fact is the Government are facing a crisis and the Madras Government have taken a big step. For no Government in the history of our State has taken such a step so far. They have taken six crores of rupees out of the treasury to meet famine conditions in Rayalaseema. This is the first time that any Government have done so. At a time like this it is the



28th March 1952] [Sri Kala Venkata Rao]

bounden duty of the people to co-operate with the Government. So to say that there is no progress in the policy of the Government is most uncharitable. Sir, Dr. Gurubatham spoke about Khaddar and he said that under a national Government much encouragement is not given. Sir, he was himself a Minister in charge of Firka Development; he continued the work in respect of Khadi started during Mr. Prakasam's Ministry; and to-day in 52 firkas intensive Khadi work is being actually done."

DR. S. GURUBATHAM :—" I said the Britishers killed hand-spinning industry."

\* SRI KALA VENKATA RAO :—" I am sorry I did not catch him properly. With regard to hand-spinning and khadi, both were encouraged by the first Ministry; that work was continued by the second Ministry in which I was the Revenue Minister and Dr. Gurubatham was in charge of Firka Development and our present Government have done all they could to foster that cause.

" Sir, this is the last day of the last session of the present Legislative Council and the present Government will be laying down their office soon. On this occasion I wish to say a few words. I feel that we should help and encourage the Government of the day, whichever party sits on the Treasury Bench, rather than talk of several things for which they are not responsible. We should not take political advantage of a bad situation in the country. Our country is really progressing and not regressing. It requires the joint effort of all people to create a pakka Welfare State in this Country. The poverty of India will increase or decrease according to such efforts. Sir, you have been kind to all the Members of the House uniformly all these six years. When I was the Revenue Minister I had to pilot a Bill in this House and but for your uniform courtesy and help it would not have been possible for me to get through that measure in this House. When I was a Minister again recently for four months, I had hardly any occasion to come to the House except for two or three days. I have been observing from outside and inside the very efficient and dignified manner in which the proceedings of this Council have been conducted during the last five and a half years of its existence. I heartily congratulate you on your achievement. I am certain that all the Members will join with me in throwing at you not one bouquet but many bouquets—I hope they will not hurt you—in token of our appreciation of the way in which you conducted the proceedings of this House."

12-30  
p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The question is—

' That the Madras Consolidated Fund (Withdrawal of Moneys) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 2 of 1952), as passed by the Legislative Assembly and transmitted to the Council be read a third time and passed.' "

The motion was carried.